

REDACTED

REDACTED

BEFORE THE
DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY
BOARD OF MEDICAL QUALITY ASSURANCE
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation)
Against:)

EDWIN H. FORD, M.D.)
Certificate No. A-18857)

No. D-3031

Respondent)
_____)


DECISION

The attached Stipulation is hereby adopted by the
Division of Medical Quality of the Board of Medical Quality
Assurance as its Decision in the above-entitled matter.

This Decision shall become effective on December 15, 1983.

IT IS SO ORDERED November 15, 1983.

DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY
BOARD OF MEDICAL QUALITY ASSURANCE


MILLER MEDEARIS
Secretary-Treasurer

1 GEORGE DEUKMEJIAN, Attorney General
of the State of California
2 LAWRENCE C. KUPERMAN,
Deputy Attorney General
3 110 West A Street, Suite 700
San Diego, California 92101
4 Telephone: (619) 237-7309

5 Attorneys for Complainant
6
7

8 BEFORE THE
9 DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY
10 BOARD OF MEDICAL QUALITY ASSURANCE
11 DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS
12 STATE OF CALIFORNIA
13

14 In the Matter of the Accusation) No. D-3031
Against:)
15)
EDWIN H. FORD, M.D.)
16 4023 Birch Street) STIPULATION AND
Newport Beach, CA 92714) DECISION OF THE BOARD
17)
Certificate No. A-018857)
18)
Respondent.)
19)

20 IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED BY AND BETWEEN
21 THE PARTIES to the above-entitled matter that the following
22 allegations are true.

23 1. Robert Rowland, complainant herein and Executive
24 Director of the Board of Medical Quality Assurance of the State
25 of California, is represented by John K. Van De Kamp, Attorney
26 General of the State of California by Lawrence C. Kuperman,
27 Deputy Attorney General.

1 2. Edwin H. Ford, M.D., (hereinafter respondent) is
2 represented by Douglas Liechty, Esq. who has been retained as
3 his attorney in connection with this stipulation. Respondent
4 has counseled with Douglas Liechte concerning the effect of this
5 stipulation, which respondent has carefully read and fully
6 understands.

7 3. Respondent has received and read the accusation
8 which is presently on file and pending as Case No. D-3031
9 before the Division of Medical Quality of the Baord of Medical
10 Quality Assurance, State of California.

11 4. Respondent understands the nature of the charges
12 alleged in the above-mentioned accusation and that the charges
13 and allegations if proved would constitute cause for imposing
14 discipline upon respondent's medical license issued by the Board
15 of Medical Quality Assurance.

16 5. Respondent and his counsel are aware of each of
17 respondent's rights including the right to a hearing on the
18 charges and allegations, the right to confront and cross-examine
19 witnesses who may testify against him, the right to present
20 evidence in his favor and call witnesses on his behalf, the
21 right to testify himself, the right to contest the charges and
22 allegations, the right to reconsideration, review by the
23 Superior Court and to appeal to any other court, and any other
24 rights which may be accorded to him pursuant to the California
25 Administrative Procedure Act (Government Code section 11500 et
26 seq.). Respondent understands that in signing this stipulation
27 rather than contesting the accusation, he is enabling the

1 Division of Medical Quality of the Board of Medical Quality
2 Assurance to issue the following order from this stipulation
3 without further action.

4 6. Respondent freely and voluntarily waives each and
5 every one of the rights set forth hereinabove, and for the sole
6 purpose of this proceeding before the Division of Medical
7 Quality and no other, does not contest the following charges in
8 the accusation:

9 A. In or about 1959, respondent was issued
10 physicians and surgeons certificate No. A-018857 by the Board.
11 The license is in good standing.

12 B. On or about 10-30-80, respondent undertook a
13 planned home delivery of patient M [REDACTED] S [REDACTED]. The preg-
14 nancy was Mrs. S [REDACTED]'s first.

15 Prior to the start of labor, Mrs. S [REDACTED]'s pregnancy
16 had exceeded 42 weeks of gestation and had entered the 43rd
17 week. On her last prenatal visit to Doctor Ford, Mrs. S [REDACTED]
18 exhibited signs of pre-eclampsia with proteinuria and hyperten-
19 sion of 140/90.

20 Mrs. S [REDACTED] went into labor on October 30, 1980, at
21 approximately 4:00 p.m. She was attended by midwife Cathy
22 Tredzise until respondent arrived at 0315, October 31, 1980.

23 At approximatley 0400, respondent artificially
24 ruptured the membranes. The amniotic fluid appeared to be
25 stained with blood and small amounts of greenish-brown material.

26 /
27 /

1 Between 0400 and 0500, the baby's heartbeat slowed to
2 approximately 100 beats per minute.

3 At approximately 0500, respondent began administering
4 a labor-inducing drug intramuscularly alternating arms every 20
5 minutes for a total of approximately six injections.

6 At approximately 0630, respondent performed an
7 episiotomy and a baby girl was born shortly thereafter. At the
8 time of birth, the baby was covered with a dark, thick, greenish
9 material and blood, and she was not breathing. Respondent
10 slapped the baby's feet and a small bulb syringe was used to
11 clean out the baby's mouth and nasal passages. Oxygen bag
12 breathing of the baby was carried out by respondent.

13 The baby was taken to the Long Beach Memorial Hospital
14 where at the time of admission meconium was found in the baby's
15 lungs and she had a pulse rate of 60 beats per minute with
16 supportive measures. The baby did not breathe spontaneously.

17 After taking the baby to the hospital, respondent
18 returned to the home of Mrs. S [REDACTED] where he attempted to repair
19 the episiotomy. After the repair, no post-partem instructions
20 were given to Mrs. S [REDACTED], and later in the day, a request for
21 pain medication by Mrs. S [REDACTED] was refused by respondent.

22 After the baby's admission to the hospital, Mrs.
23 S [REDACTED] was notified by the hospital the baby was in critical
24 condition and it was suggested that she and her husband come to
25 the hospital. Mrs. S [REDACTED] was unable to walk and was carried
26 into the hospital on a stretcher. Mrs. S [REDACTED] was thereafter
27 admitted into the emergency room with a temperature of 101

1 degrees, and blood pressure of 160 to 130/110, and a problem
2 with fluid retention. Mrs. S [REDACTED] had internal bleeding in the
3 site of the episiotomy with resultant vulvovaginal hematoma.
4 Mrs. S [REDACTED] required surgery and treatment for her condition.

5 The baby died on November 1, 1980, from meconium
6 aspiration as a result of respondent's improper care.

7 The license of respondent is subject to disciplinary
8 action pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 2234(b)
9 and (d) in that respondent was grossly negligent and incompetent
10 in his treatment of M [REDACTED] S [REDACTED] and her baby, as follows:

11 1) Respondent failed to recognize Mrs.
12 S [REDACTED]'s pregnancy as high risk to both the baby and
13 mother requiring an institutional birth with available
14 back-up care.

15 2) Respondent failed to recognize and/or
16 take steps to deal with signs of fetal distress during
17 labor, and failed to intubate the baby after birth; and

18 3) Respondent failed to properly repair
19 Mrs. S [REDACTED]'s lacerations and to give follow-up care
20 for her toxemia after the baby was born.

21 7. Based on the foregoing stipulations and recitals,
22 it is stipulated and agreed that the Division of Medical Quality
23 may issue the following decision and order.

24 ORDER

25 It is hereby ordered that license number A-018857
26 issued to respondent Edwin H. Ford, M.D., is revoked. However,

27 /

1 the revocation is stayed and respondent is placed on probation
2 for ten years on the following terms and conditions:

3 A. Respondent shall not practice in the fields of
4 obstetrics and gynecology until and unless the following condi-
5 tions have been satisfied:

6 1) Respondent shall submit to the Division for
7 its prior approval, an intensive clinical training program
8 in obstetrics and gynecology. The exact number of hours
9 and the specific content of the program shall be determined
10 by the Division or its designee, but it shall be the
11 equivalent to a one year residency type program in an
12 accredited hospital.

13 2) After completing the intensive clinical
14 training program, respondent shall take and must pass an
15 oral/clinical examination in obstetrics and gynecology to
16 be administered by the Division or its designee. If
17 respondent fails this examination, respondent must wait
18 three months between reexaminations, except that after
19 three failures respondent must wait one year to take each
20 necessary reexamination thereafter. The Division shall pay
21 the cost of the first examination and respondent shall pay
22 the cost of any subsequent examinations. Respondent shall
23 not practice obstetrics or gynecology until respondent has
24 passed this examination and has been so notified by the
25 Division in writing

26 /
27

1 C. Respondent shall obey all federal, state and
2 local laws, and all rules governing the practice of medicine in
3 California.

4 D. Respondent shall submit quarterly declarations
5 under penalty of perjury on forms provided by the Division,
6 stating whether there has been compliance with all the condi-
7 tions of probation.

8 E. Respondent shall comply with the Division's
9 probation surveillance program.

10 F. Respondent shall appear in person for interviews
11 with the Division's medical consultant upon request at various
12 intervals and with reasonable notice.

13 G. In the event respondent should leave California
14 to reside or to practice outside the state, respondent must
15 notify in writing the Division of the dates of departure and
16 return. Periods of residency or practice outside California
17 will not apply to the reduction of this probation period.

18 H. Upon successful completion of probation,
19 respondent's certificate will be fully restored.

20 I. If respondent violates probation in any respect,
21 the Division, after giving respondent notice and the opportunity
22 to be heard, may revoke probation and carry out the disciplinary
23 order that was stayed. If an accusation or petition to revoke
24 probation is filed against the respondent during probation, the
25 Division shall have continuing jurisdiction until the matter is
26 final and the period of probation shall be extended until the
27 matter is final.

1 I concur in the stipulation and order.

2 Dated: 10-19-83

3 JOHN K. VAN DE KAMP, Attorney General
4 LAWRENCE C. KUPERMAN,
5 Deputy Attorney General

6 By Lawrence C. Kuperman
7 LAWRENCE C. KUPERMAN,
8 Deputy Attorney General

9 Attorneys for Complainant

10 I concur in the stipulation and order.

11 Dated: 9-19-83
12 10-27-83

13 DOUGLAS LIECHTY, Esq.
14

15 Attorney for Respondent

16 I have read the above stipulation fully and have
17 discussed it with my counsel. I understand that by its terms I
18 will be waiving certain rights accorded me under California law.
19 I also understand that by its terms the Board of Medical Quality
20 Assurance will issue a Decision and Order on this stipulation
21 whereby my license to practice medicine will be subject to
22 certain terms and conditions. I agree to the above stipulations
23 for settlement.

24 Dated: 10-11-83
25 10-28-83

26 Edwin H. Ford M.D.
27

Respondent

1 JOHN K. VAN DE KAMP, Attorney General
 LAWRENCE C. KUPERMAN,
 2 Deputy Attorney General
 110 West A Street, Suite 700
 3 San Diego, California 92101
 Telephone: (619) 237-7309
 4 Attorneys for Complainant
 5

6
 7 BEFORE THE
 8 BOARD OF MEDICAL QUALITY ASSURANCE
 9 DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY
 10 STATE OF CALIFORNIA

11 In the Matter of the Accusation) NO. D-3031
 Against:)
 12) ACCUSATION
 EDWIN H. FORD, M.D.)
 13 4023 Birch Street)
 Newport Beach, California 92660)
 14)
 Certificate No. A-018857)
 15)
 Respondent.)
 16)

17 Complainant, Robert Rowland, alleges:

18 1. He is the Executive Director of the Board of
 19 Medical Quality Assurance and makes this accusation in his
 20 official capacity.

21 2. In or about 1959, respondent was issued physicians
 22 and surgeons certificate No. A-018857 by the Board. The license
 23 is in good standing.

24 3. Business and Professions Code (hereinafter "Code")
 25 section 2220 authorizes the Division of Medical Quality to take
 26 disciplinary action against the holder of a physician and
 27 surgeon's certificate who commits unprofessional conduct.

1 4. Code section 2234(b) and (d) provide that
2 unprofessional conduct includes gross negligence and
3 incompetence, respectively.

4 5. On or about 10-30-80, respondent undertook a
5 planned home delivery of patient M. S. The
6 pregnancy was Mrs. S.'s first.

7 Prior to the start of labor, Mrs. S.'s pregnancy
8 had exceeded 42 weeks of gestation and had entered the 43rd
9 week. On her last prenatal visit to Dr. Ford, Mrs. S.
10 exhibited signs of pre-eclampsia with proteinuria and
11 hypertension of 140/90.

12 Mrs. Shelley went into labor on October 30, 1980, at
13 approximately 4:00 p.m. She was attended by midwife Cathy
14 Tredzise until respondent arrived at 0315, October 31, 1980.

15 At approximately 0400, respondent artificially ruptured
16 the membranes. The amniotic fluid appeared to be stained with
17 blood and small amounts of greenish-brown material.

18 Between 0400 and 0500, the baby's heartbeat slowed to
19 approximately 100 beats per minute.

20 At approximately 0500, respondent began administering a
21 labor-inducing drug intramuscularly alternating arms every 20
22 minutes for a total of approximately six injections.

23 At approximately 0630, respondent performed an
24 episiotomy and a baby girl was born shortly thereafter. At the
25 time of birth, the baby was covered with a dark, thick, greenish
26 material and blood, and she was not breathing. Respondent
27 slapped the baby's feet and a small bulb syringe was used to

1 clean out the baby's mouth and nasal passages. Oxygen bag
2 breathing of the baby was carried out by respondent.

3 The baby was taken to the Long Beach Memorial Hospital
4 where at the time of admission meconium was found in the baby's
5 lungs and she had a pulse rate of 60 beats per minute with
6 supportive measures. The baby did not breathe spontaneously.

7 After taking the baby to the hospital, respondent
8 returned to the home of Mrs. S█████ where he attempted to repair
9 the episiotomy. After the repair, no post-partem instructions
10 were given to Mrs. S█████, and later in the day, a request for
11 pain medication by Mrs. S█████ was refused by respondent.

12 After the baby's admission to the hospital, Mrs.
13 S█████ was notified by the hospital the baby was in critical
14 condition and it was suggested that she and her husband come to
15 the hospital. Mrs. S█████ was unable to walk and was carried
16 into the hospital on a stretcher. Mrs. S█████ was thereafter
17 admitted into the emergency room with a temperature of 101
18 degrees, and blood pressure of 160 to 130/110, and a problem
19 with fluid retention. Mrs. S█████ had internal bleeding in the
20 site of the episiotomy with resultant vulvovaginal hematoma.
21 Mrs. S█████ required surgery and treatment for her condition.

22 The baby died on November 1, 1980, from meconium
23 aspiration as a result of respondent's improper care.

24 The license of respondent is subject to disciplinary
25 action pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 2234(b)
26 in that respondent was grossly negligent in his treatment of
27 Marianne Shelley and her baby as follows:

1 a. Respondent failed to recognize Mrs. S██████'s
2 pregnancy as high risk to both the baby and mother requiring an
3 institutional birth with available back-up care.

4 b. Respondent failed to recognize and/or take steps
5 to deal with signs of fetal distress during labor, and failed to
6 intubate the baby after birth; and

7 c. Respondent failed to properly repair Mrs. Shelley's
8 lacerations and to give follow-up care for her toxemia after the
9 baby was born.

10 7. The license of respondent is subject to
11 disciplinary action pursuant to Business and Professions Code
12 section 2234 (d) in that respondent was incompetent in connection
13 with Kathleen Shelley and her baby as more particularly alleged
14 in paragraph six.

15 WHEREFORE, complainant requests that the Board hold
16 a hearing on the matters alleged herein and following said
17 hearing take disciplinary action as is provided in Code section
18 2227, and take such other and further action as may be proper.

19 DATED: March 22, 1983.

ROBERT ROWLAND
Executive Director
Board of Medical Quality Assurance
State of California

Complainant